United Nations A/CN.10/PV.184

General Assembly

Official Records

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

184th Meeting

Monday, 18 April 1994, 10.30 a.m.

New York

Chairman: Mr. Mongbe . . . . . (Benin)

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

Opening of the session

The Chairman *(interpretation from French)*: I declare open the 184th plenary meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the first meeting of its 1994 substantive session.

Statement by the Chairman

The Chairman *(interpretation from French)*: I am moved by the honour I have today to welcome members to the 1994 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, this important deliberative body forming part of the multilateral machinery to establish and strengthen peace.

I am even more moved by the challenging task of succeeding Ambassador Luiz de Araujo Castro of Brazil, who guided the Commission's work in 1993 with great skill and distinction. It seems fitting also to pay sincere tribute to him, to his colleagues of the Bureau and the Chairmen of the Working Groups, who showed great dedication and remarkable control of our negotiations.

I welcome the presence on the podium of Mr. Davinic, Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs. In addition, I am reassured to have at my side our friend, the dynamic and tireless Secretary of the Commission, Mr. Kuo Chung Lin, whose technical support will be most valuable. I am particularly pleased to have the eminent diplomats who have been elected members of the Bureau and Chairmen of the Working Groups to assist me in my duties.

I should once again like to express my thanks to all delegations for having unanimously endorsed my selection by the Group of African States to guide our deliberations this year. I know that I can count on all members to help me in the discharge of this lofty responsibility. I wish to assure members that Benin, which I have the privilege to represent in the United Nations, takes as an honour the Commission's consideration and the confidence it has placed in this humble servant.

I have already underscored the importance of this Commission. Yes, the Disarmament Commission, which some, for their own reasons, tend to undervalue or consider a mechanism of the second order, retains all its importance because of its noble mandate, the seriousness of its deliberations and the weight its recommendations carry in the decision-making process in the field of disarmament. In other words, as we get down to business we must be convinced that we are called upon to do useful work. We must rid ourselves of any tendency to feel that we are engaged merely in intellectual lucubrations, that ours is but a process of producing recommendations and decisions with no practical effect. I say this because I know that there are some among us who feel very uncomfortable about this, having in mind the regrettable attitude in some quarters that the multilateral disarmament system has little worth.

The Disarmament Commission must continue its international, multidimensional efforts to promote security and preserve peace among peoples. Its work must be placed in that context and must be aimed at providing all Member States with a framework for deep, fruitful reflection to negotiate agreements on arms control and limitation.

94-85420 (E)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, room C-178, and incorporated in a copy of the record. Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The work of the last two years has resulted in the elaboration of concrete recommendations on, first, objective military information and confidence-building, valuable elements without which progress in the disarmament process would be difficult, and, secondly, negotiations on regional disarmament arrangements, which constitute the universal acceptance of this pragmatic approach that makes up part of global disarmament efforts. Looking back on that work, we can rightly hope that the Commission will once again show its effectiveness.

As our agenda shows, our deliberations this year will again focus on important questions to advance the disarmament process, a general and comprehensive process subject to international control, according to the wishes of a large segment of the international community. I am referring, first, to the process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security; secondly, to the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields; and, thirdly, to international arms transfers.

The Commission's report, contained in document A/48/42, highlights the progress achieved in respect of the first two points. Indeed, despite the substantive differences of opinion still remaining, because of the obvious political interests at stake, there is consensus on a programme for the preparation of guidelines for nuclear disarmament.

With regard to the role of science and technology, while there is as yet no comprehensive agreement, a document has been prepared containing guidelines that have been provisionally agreed. I dare to hope that our proceedings will continue to demonstrate our will to achieve consensus in order to advance the cause of disarmament.

In this connection, I should like to express my satisfaction, and convey the gratitude of one and all, to Ambassador Peggy Mason of Canada, Ambassador Wolfgang Hoffman of Germany and Ambassador Victor Batiouk of Ukraine, who with talent and determination have thrown themselves into the consultations that have in large part made it possible to find points of agreement. I am convinced that their remarkable work will make it possible, by the end of this session, for us to reconcile the legitimate concerns of the various parties with regard to security and disarmament, for the sake of lasting peace.

Unlike the first two items, which have been on the Commission's agenda for several years, the question of international arms transfers is a new one. It is the product of an initiative by the delegation of Colombia, which deserves our appreciation. This question will rightly be the subject of preliminary consideration dealing with such issues as definition, scope and priorities.

I am pleased to note the spirit of compromise that has led delegations as a whole to agree that our Commission should prepare, on the basis of resolution 46/36 H, recommendations with a view to

> "eradicating the illicit trade in all kinds of weaponry and military equipment, a most disturbing and dangerous phenomenon often associated with terrorism, drug trafficking, organized crime and mercenary and other destabilizing activities". *(resolution 46/36 H, para. 2)*

Like me, members will understand from this outline - which was not intended to be exhaustive - that we have a sizeable task before us. But since the 1993 substantive session, thanks to demonstrations of political will by the Governments we represent, sensitive issues of all kinds have been the subject of agreement in other organs within the multilateral disarmament machinery, such as the First Committee and the Conference on Disarmament. Hence, there is reason to hope that the Disarmament Commission, whose deliberations are based on the search for consensus, will contribute to that positive, encouraging development in the process leading towards general and complete disarmament.

Among the issues on which agreement has been reached, I should mention the following: negotiation of an international convention on a complete ban on nuclear testing; the international agreement on the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes; the relationship between development and disarmament; and the need to review the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. Other important questions deserve the same consideration, and, to succeed, the Commission must set to work with resolve.

The end of the cold war aroused great optimism in all peoples. The disappearance of world-wide rivalry between two previously implacably hostile blocs ought to have meant a halt to the armament or overarmament that prevailed. But what do we see now? Unfortunately, five years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, a concrete symbol of the end of a period of neither peace nor war, optimism seems to be at an end. Great disorder disturbs the

geopolitical landscape, creating uncertainty, alarm and dismay.

Conflicts are raging in several regions: in the Balkans, the scene of a genuine human tragedy; in the Caucasus and Crimea, where ancient hatreds have re-emerged violently following the breakup of the former Soviet Union; in Somalia, Liberia, Rwanda, Burundi, the Sudan, Sri Lanka and the Philippines, where regional or ethnic confrontation - a euphemism - continues; in the Middle East, where the Oslo Agreement between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization and their Washington Declaration gave the world hope for a turning point in the history of conflict and unfortunate relations between the two great brother peoples of the region, but where demented acts have continued, motivated by a lapse of reason, creating monsters and encouraging the language of weapons; and finally in Latin America, where the last guerrillas remain at large despite commendable efforts at negotiation with the legal Governments of the region. These conflicts employ weapons: not arrows, axes, machetes, slingshots or catapults, but sophisticated weapons - even if not yet nuclear weapons or ultra-modern war matériel.

In these circumstances, the Commission must not view the problem of disarmament solely through the distorting lens of the special and nearly exclusive importance attached to nuclear weapons. It must, of course, address nuclear disarmament so as to give no respite to the military-industrial forces which are pleased and madly proud to be able to destroy the Earth many times over. But it must also address the elimination of all weapons that can spark hotbeds - or "warmbeds" - of tension anywhere in the world, for, as the French philosopher Jean Guéhenno put it,

> "The worst betrayal of intelligence is to make excuses for the world as it is".

The United Nations, of which our Commission is a part, must take no decision that gives the impression of making excuses for the world as it is: constantly threatened with destruction or rupture by weapons. That is why I count on the heightened awareness of the delegations in this room, and on the Commission's calm deliberations, to identify measures that will help guarantee international security, the consolidation of which demands disarmament.

All Member States - large or small, powerful or weak, rich or poor, developed or developing, non-aligned or other - must show the political will that is indispensable to ensure speedy progress in the Commission's negotiations. We must therefore avoid confrontation, and try to cultivate a spirit of mutual understanding and persuasion. The success of our work depends on it.

Adoption of the agenda

The Chairman *(interpretation from French):* As members of the Commission may recall, at our organizational session held in December 1993 we considered and approved the provisional agenda now before the Commission. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the provisional agenda as contained in document A/CN.10/L.34.

It was so decided.

Organization of work

The Chairman *(interpretation from French):* As members will recall, in 1990 the Disarmament Commission adopted by consensus a text of the reform programme, entitled "Ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission" (A/CN.10/137). At the Commission's organizational session, the implementation of that reform programme was duly reflected in the organizational arrangements for the current substantive session. The arrangements included: the approval of the provisional agenda; the establishment of one Working Group on each of the three substantive agenda items; the appointment of Chairmen of the Working Groups; a decision on the date and duration of the 1994 substantive session; and a general programme of work for the current session.

In complying with the spirit of the reform programme, the Chairmen of the established Working Groups have effectively utilized the off-session period for various types of informal consultations on their respective agenda items among the interested delegations. I am convinced that these pre-session consultations have greatly facilitated the substantive work of the current session.

However, there is a follow-up matter with regard to the election of the Chairman of Working Group I. On 24 January 1994 I was informed by the Chairman of the Group of Eastern European States that Ambassador Victor Batiouk had been called to other duties and would no longer be Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations. Consequently, he was unable to assume the chairmanship of Working Group I of the Disarmament Commission for 1994. The Group of Eastern European States has endorsed the candidature of Mr. Volodymyr Khandogy of Ukraine to the chairmanship of Working Group I on agenda item 4,

entitled "Process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security, with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons".

Accordingly, if I hear no objection, I shall take it that it is the wish of the Disarmament Commission to elect Mr. Volodymyr Khandogy of Ukraine as Chairman of Working Group I.

It was so decided.

The Chairman *(interpretation from French):* I wish to extend my warm congratulations to Mr. Khandogy of Ukraine on his unanimous election as Chairman of Working Group I.

The President *(interpretation from French):* In view of the limited time available to the Commission, it was the general understanding that there should be a limited general exchange of views allowing delegations to make statements on any or all agenda items. Four meetings are allocated to such purposes, as indicated in the general programme of work and the weekly timetable, which, I believe, have been circulated. I urge those delegations wishing to make general statements to inscribe their names in the list of speakers with the Secretariat as soon as possible. The deadline for such inscriptions is 1 p.m. today. In addition, 25 copies of statements should be provided to the Secretariat.

If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to proceed in this manner.

It was so decided.

The President *(interpretation from French):* As for the allocation of time for each agenda item, the principle of equal footing and flexibility for practical purposes will be observed and the Secretariat will issue a weekly timetable on the programme of work during the session, taking into account the needs of each subsidiary body through consultations with the Chairmen of the Working Groups.

As members will no doubt recall, at our organizational session it was understood that agenda item 6 regarding international arms transfers would be considered by Working Group III in a preliminary stage, and only a limited number of formal meetings - perhaps six, depending on circumstances - of that Working Group will be held during this session so as to define the scope of the subject, identify the issues concerned and elaborate elements for a text of guidelines on international arms transfers to be deliberated next year.

It was also decided that consideration of item 4, regarding nuclear disarmament, and item 5, regarding the role of science and technology, would be concluded at the 1994 session in accordance with the relevant provisions of the reform programme adopted in 1990. In this connection, it should be noted that paragraphs 3 and 4 of section 3 of document A/CN.10/137, entitled "Ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission" state:

> "3. From 1991, no subject should, in principle, be maintained on the working agenda for more than three consecutive years. At each session, the Commission should review, for possible reconsideration, any subject that had been suspended.
>
> "4. If no agreement can be reached on a specific agenda item, the report of the Commission should contain a joint statement or a Chairman's summary of the proceedings to reflect views or positions of different delegations, particularly in the case of those agenda items to be suspended for a period of time."

Therefore, a heavier workload for Working Groups I and II is anticipated. I would appeal to all delegations to make every effort faithfully to implement the provisions of the reform programme, which was adopted by consensus, and to conclude agenda items 4 and 5 as so decided.

A general programme of work (A/CN.10/1994/CRP.1) for the entire session has been agreed and circulated as an indicative timetable for the work of the Commission,subject to further adjustment, as necessary. As I pointed out earlier, the programme of work for the second and third weeks will be decided this Friday by the Bureau in consultations with chairmen of Working Groups.

In order to utilize efficiently the available conference resources, I appeal to all members of the Disarmament Commission to be punctual in attending all the scheduled plenary meetings of the Commission and the meetings of the Working Groups. Those who have known me in other circumstances will know that I begin on time. If a meeting is scheduled to begin at 10 a.m., I shall call on the first speaker at 10.05 a.m. even if there are only two delegations present in the room. I believe that this is the best way to save time.

I suggest that the Chairmen of the Working Groups proceed in the same way. If this is done, we shall be able to conclude our work within a reasonable time. It is indeed high time to rationalize our methods of work.

Regarding documentation for the current session, I wish to point out that last year's report of the Disarmament Commission, to the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly - that is, document A/48/42 - as well as the documents listed in the report, will serve as background documents for this session, particularly the Chairman's working paper in the annexes. It is my understanding that some Chairman's working papers have already been circulated in connection with the work of the Working Groups. Previous reports of the Commission will of course also be useful for reference.

Since there are three items on which there will be intensive deliberations at this session - particularly item 6, which is new - the Commission will undoubtedly have before it a number of working papers submitted by delegations on those subjects. I should like to urge those delegations that intend to submit papers to transmit them to the Secretariat as soon as possible for translation and reproduction.

I turn now to the status of the non-governmental organizations. As in previous years, non-governmental organizations are welcome to attend the plenary meetings and the meetings of the Committee of the Whole of the Disarmament Commission as observers. I understand that an intensive programme on disarmament issues has been organized by the Non-Governmental Organization Committee on Disarmament at the United Nations in connection with the current session of the Disarmament Commission, particularly on 20 and 21 April. I wish the non-governmental organizations all success in their work.

Having commented on various aspects of the organization of work for this session, I shall now call on those delegations that wish to make general statements at this stage on various items of the agenda.

General exchange of views on the three substantive agenda items

Mr. Stephanou (Greece): Speaking on behalf of the European Union, I have the honour of congratulating you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of the 1994 substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Your outstanding skills and professionalism and your dedication to the purposes and principles of the Charter, which have been proved and recognized in your capacity as Permanent Representative of your country, Benin, constitute the best confirmation that under your able guidance our efforts will be successful. We, as States members of the European Union, can assure you of our full cooperation to this end.

Our congratulations and thanks are addressed also to Ambassador Luiz Augusto de Araujo Castro, who served so successfully as Chairman of last year's session of the Commission - a session that was particularly demanding.

This year's session will be equally demanding, as two agenda items are to be concluded, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 48/77 A.

In spite of the significant progress achieved in disarmament and arms control, following the end of the cold war and the East-West confrontation, the world has not yet become a safe place in which to live. The threat of global destruction has been reduced. Nevertheless, new uncertainties and new risks are emerging throughout the world in a growing number of local and regional conflicts that underscore the importance of regional arms control and responsible export policies.

The excessive and destabilizing accumulation of conventional weapons and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction are generating new dangers to international peace and security.

Restraint in transfers of arms, confidence-building and transparency are one aspect of the preservation of peace. Disposal of weapons and conversion are new aspects of the growing importance of disarmament. But effective action against the accumulation of weapons as well as the least possible diversion for the acquisition of armaments of the world's human and economic resources requires international cooperation.

Among the possibilities for international cooperation that could be considered is the adoption of principles and guidelines for conventional-arms transfers, with the objective of achieving voluntary restraint and responsibility in such transfers. In this regard, we draw particular attention to the forum for security cooperation held by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) on 25 November 1993.

The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms was established to promote increasing levels of transparency in armaments, in order to enhance confidence between States and therefore strengthen international security. The Register is a first step in transparency and could also be seen as a first step towards a cooperative system in the field of conventional-arms control. The European Union calls upon all States to submit returns to the Register by the end of April.

The European Union commends the Commission for the rationalization it undertook last year in its work, when in its organizational meeting on 9 December 1993 it decided to reiterate the three-item phased approach.

We also feel confident that, following General Assembly resolution 48/87 for the rationalization of the work of the First Committee, the role and the contribution of the United Nations to the cause of international peace and security will be enhanced in a more effective way. We are indebted to Ambassador Adolph Ritter von Wagner for his efforts in this respect.

At last year's substantive session, a successful outcome was achieved in the field of regional disarmament. This year we have before us three items, two of which should be concluded.

Nuclear disarmament continues to be one of our highest priorities in the field of arms control and disarmament. Considerable progress has been achieved in this area with the Treaty on intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF), the two Treaties on strategic arms reductions (START), including the Lisbon Protocol, and drastic unilateral nuclear reductions by both the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Russia in Europe.

Our common wish is for further reductions at a global level. We believe that efforts should focus on the rapid and safe implementation of existing nuclear arms control agreements and commitments. The two members of the European Union which are nuclear-weapon States have already made a meaningful contribution by making reductions in some of their nuclear-weapon programmes.

The General Assembly at its forty-eighth session adopted by consensus two important resolutions relevant to nuclear non-proliferation - resolution 48/70, on a comprehensive test ban, and resolution 48/75 L, on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. Progress in the comprehensive test-ban treaty negotiations in the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament, which began in February this year, has been encouraging.

Within the process of nuclear arms control and the fight against proliferation, we call upon all States which have not yet done so to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). We welcome the accession to the Treaty of Belarus, Kazakhstan and Georgia as non-nuclear-weapon States, and express the hope that Ukraine will soon ratify and accede to this Treaty as a non-nuclear-weapon State, in fulfilment of its commitments under the Lisbon Protocol. In this connection, we welcome the Trilateral Statement by the Presidents of the United States of America, of the Russian Federation and of Ukraine, issued on 14 January 1994.

In accordance with Article X (2) of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, next year a Conference will pursue the question of the Treaty's extension.

The European Union recalls its commitment to unconditional and indefinite extension of the NPT as the cornerstone of the international nuclear non-proliferation regime. We believe that indefinite extension will be a key step in the strengthening of that regime.

The European Union considers nuclear proliferation to be a major threat to international peace and security, and therefore urges the Democratic People's Republic of Korea immediately to comply fully with its safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The European Union reaffirms the importance of IAEA safeguards in the implementation of the Treaty. Indeed, it should be clear to everyone that is not just a regional question, but, rather, a matter that involves respect for international standards and hence concerns us all.

The European Union welcomes the progress achieved towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa. It supported the relevant General Assembly resolution, resolution 48/86. The European Union commends the work of the Group of Experts designated by the United Nations in cooperation with the Organization of African Unity. It expresses satisfaction at the progress achieved in drafting the Treaty on an African nuclear-weapon-free zone, and expresses the hope that a satisfactory outcome will be achieved at the next meeting of the Group of Experts.

We call upon all States which have not yet done so to accede to the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, known as BTWC. The European Union also looks forward to this year's Conference of the States Parties to the Convention, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 48/65.

The European Union supports the implementation of confidence-building measures aimed at developing transparency in the handling of potential weapon agents. We appeal to all States Parties to the Convention to participate in confidence-building exercises, but the Convention's main weakness is the lack of adequate

provisions for verifying suspected breaches. Furthermore, the European Union looks forward to the forthcoming conference of States Parties to the Convention in September, in the belief that, building on the work of the "verex" Ad Hoc Group of Government Experts, the conference will be able to agree to further action with a view to strengthening the BTWC in the field of verification.

We also call upon all States which have not yet done so to sign the chemical weapons Convention; that will further contribute to international peace and security. We firmly hope that the necessary number of ratifications will be deposited so that this Convention will enter into force as soon as possible.

Among other issues connected with the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is the restriction of transfers of missiles capable of delivering them. The Missile Technology Control Regime, to which all member States of the European Union belong, was established in 1987. The guidelines are not designed to impede national civil space programmes or international cooperation in such programmes, as long as these cannot contribute to delivery systems of weapons of mass destruction. We call on all States to adopt the Regime's guidelines in the interests of peace and security.

The positive trend in disarmament negotiations confronts us with a problem in relation to the implementation of disarmament agreements - that is, the disposal in a safe, transparent, cost-effective and environmentally sound manner of surplus military material, including weapons of mass destruction, and, in the case of nuclear weapons, their fissile material. The role of science and technology is evident in this respect. It is also of vital importance as far as the conversion of production facilities from military to civilian purposes and methods of verification of compliance with arms control and disarmament agreements are concerned.

The European Union is therefore convinced that, as stated in resolution 48/67, progress in the application of science and technology contributes substantially to the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements. We believe that science and technology thus contribute to the enhancement of international peace and security and to the promotion of the social and economic development of humankind.

In view of the overall importance of disarmament-related technologies, all possibilities should be examined through multilateral dialogue with a view to making these technologies available on a global scale, bearing in mind the need to maintain and to ensure an effective balance between access to sensitive technology and the unequivocal non-proliferation commitments to which the international community has subscribed.

The European Union hopes that, on the basis of the progress made during the 1993 sessions of the Disarmament Commission and of the General Assembly and under the able Working Group chairmanship of Ambassador Peggy Mason, the Disarmament Commission will this year adopt guidelines and recommendations on science and technology in the context of security, disarmament and other related fields.

In accordance with General Assembly resolution 48/77 A, the Disarmament Commission will examine this year, as a new item, "International arms transfers, with particular reference to resolution 46/36 H". We recognize that agreement on this issue is difficult. Everyone knows how complex it is.

Governments should consult on how to strengthen the existing cooperation aimed at constraining illicit international trade in

conventional arms and to identify possible additional measures to halt it.

While we should all accept that the excess accumulation of conventional weapons in some countries is partly due to the illicit transfer of arms, export controls and their enforcement are an important aspect of arms transfer. However, export controls, by definition, do not cover illicit weapons.

We believe that, taking as granted the willingness of all the Governments to establish close cooperation in the field of disarmament, a substantive part of which is the struggle against the illicit trade in arms, we should coordinate our action in order for our Commission to proceed with the necessary steps to this end. We believe, therefore, that the Commission should focus its attention at the current session on, first, clarifying existing conceptual difficulties and, more specifically, on how to deal with the issue; and secondly, on investigating underlying causes and on how the various parameters could be structured in order to ease international and regional tensions, as well as to promote disarmament measures and thus contribute to international peace and security. We believe that this will allow us to lay a solid foundation for concerted international action for dealing with this pressing problem in all its dimensions.

Finally, the European Union would like once more to assure you, Sir, of its cooperation in making progress and in bringing the deliberations on nuclear disarmament and on the role of science and technology to a fruitful conclusion by establishing a set of general guidelines and principles. We will also participate actively in the discussion of the new agenda item, "International arms transfers, with particular reference to resolution 46/36 H", which can greatly contribute to the enhancement of arms control and disarmament and consequently to the promotion and safeguarding of world peace and security.

Mr. VALLE (Brazil): Allow me, at the outset, to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to preside over this important body. My delegation feels confident that under your able leadership the Disarmament Commission will discharge in an effective manner the mandate entrusted to it by resolution 48/77 A. You can count on the full cooperation of the Brazilian delegation. Congratulations are also in order to the other members of the Bureau who will assist you in carrying out your duties. In this connection, my delegation is also looking forward to working closely with the Chairmen of the Working Groups, Ambassador Peggy Mason of Canada, Ambassador Luis Fernando Jaramillo of Colombia and Mr. Vladimir Khandogy of Ukraine.

The changes over the last few years in the international scene have been analysed at great length in this Commission and in other forums in the United Nations system. Today i wish to comment briefly on the special and significant impact the new political atmosphere has had on the field of disarmament.

The current international scene seems to provide opportunities for strengthening meaningful measures in the field of disarmament. Over recent years important initiatives have been undertake, such as the conclusion of the chemical weapons Convention; the strengthening of the regime of the biological weapons Convention; the operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms; and important steps towards a comprehensive test ban, such as the intensification of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban at the Conference on Disarmament.

Despite these positive developments, much remains to be done. While important progress has been achieved in the field of nuclear disarmament between the two main nuclear-weapon States, the complete elimination of nuclear weapons remains the priority of the international community, as it affects global security. In this regard, the prompt and total cessation of nuclear tests is essential to cut nuclear proliferation in all its aspects. The reduction of military expenditures of the main military Powers should also be viewed as a fundamental measure for strengthening peace and security around the globe.

The Disarmament Commission has a very relevant role to play in crucial aspects of the promotion of disarmament. As the deliberative body of universal composition within the disarmament machinery, the Disarmament Commission has throughout the years adopted a number of recommendations and guidelines that have proved to be very useful to States in dealing with the issue of disarmament.

At this session the Commission has on its agenda three items that will require thorough consideration in order to arrive at meaningful results.

On the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields, the complexity of the issue of the transfer of high technology with military applications is related to the fact that it is necessary to take simultaneously into consideration two distinct aspects of the problem which, at first sight, appear to be at variance with each other.

One aspect is the concern with the proliferation in all its aspects - including horizontal and vertical - of weapons of mass destruction and sophisticated conventional weaponry, leading to arms build-ups in excess of legitimate security needs and ultimately threatening international peace and security. The other aspect is the concern with obstacles to international transfers of high-technology products, services and know-how for peaceful purposes, which are essential for the economic development of all States and for the long-term growth of international trade. Developing countries, which need to absorb high technology for development projects, and developed countries, which rely on high technology exports for jobs and growth, would both greatly benefit from unimpeded trade.

It is Brazil's consistent view that, far from being contradictory, the two concerns described above must be dealt with simultaneously. Their interrelation may be explained positively or negatively.

In a positive sense, a more stable security environment, free from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and excessive arms build-ups, would create favourable conditions for expanded transfers of high technology. Conversely, prosperity and peaceful purposes would improve the international climate and help create a cooperative international framework.

In a negative sense, the unchecked proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in all its aspects and destabilizing arms build-ups would create a widespread sense of insecurity and reinforce the tendency to restrict international transfers, even those made for peaceful purposes. Conversely, unjustified restrictions would be self-defeating in the long run, since they would increase international tensions, including North-South tensions, and force countries to shun transparency and engage in autonomous research programmes, with potential proliferation consequences.

Both the positive and the negative interrelations are presently at work. It is up to the international community to reinforce the positive and defuse the negative tendency.

In its 1994 session the Disarmament Commission has the important responsibility of successfully completing the agenda item on "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields", including the question of the transfer of high technology with military applications. Success in this task would send a most welcome positive signal to the international community in this sensitive area.

In order to achieve that result, it is important to understand clearly the possibilities and limitations of the Disarmament Commission's work on this item. On the one hand, it is, unfortunately, not yet feasible to reach consensus for either commending or condemning specific international treaties and regimes on which countries hold contradictory views; on the other hand, it is possible - and, indeed, necessary - to define clearly the areas of agreement and wide consensus. In particular, it is essential that all countries recognize the need for adequate balance between the two concerns described above. This alone would represent a useful and meaningful result for Disarmament Commission deliberations in this area.

In other words, the final result of our exercise should be of a conceptual nature, which would facilitate multilateral agreements on specific measures to address both concerns simultaneously. The Disarmament Commission's recommendations and guidelines could be useful, for instance, in preparing the ground for proposals that could lead to treaties and regimes with wider participation and to sets of rules for this area that could command universal adherence.

It is Brazil's view that the "Chairman's working paper on draft guidelines and recommendations on the 'role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields'", contained in the annex to document A/CN.10/1993/CRP.5, provides an excellent basis for consolidating the consensus which is possible today.

Regarding the current text in section III of that working paper, Brazil considers that the language in paragraph 11 should not be perceived as condemning in any way specific non-proliferation treaties and regimes; nor should paragraph 12 be seen as commending or legitimizing these same treaties and regimes: the two paragraphs are complementary and provide a coherent and balanced conceptual basis for reaching agreement on non-proliferation and technology transfer issues.

Paragraphs 15 and 16 do not intend, respectively, to commend or condemn existing treaties, regimes and national measures. It would be very difficult to reach consensus on either one in their present formulations; thus, they must be either extensively reformulated or dropped altogether.

The other paragraphs in this section - 10, 13, 14, 17 18, 19 and 20 - taken all together and in connection with paragraphs 11 and 12, are the result of careful negotiation and compromise. They provide a meaningful, balanced basis for future work and should be kept as much as possible in their current form. It is my delegation's strong conviction that we are just one step away from a successful finalization of our endeavours on this important and sensitive item.

On the question of the process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security, with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons, my delegation believes that the Chairman's working paper provides a useful basis for discussions during the present session. It seeks to reflect the tenor of the debates at the Disarmament Commission's previous session and could facilitate the successful completion of our work by narrowing the focus of our attention.

The fundamental goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons should remain at the top of our agenda. The continuing existence of any nuclear weapon clouds the prospects of a safe and peaceful international atmosphere. It is the view of the delegation of Brazil that the final text to be agreed should underscore the elements of transparency, confidence-building measures and faith in the multilateral negotiation process in this field. To do otherwise would fail to do justice to the purposes of the Disarmament Commission.

In this respect, I am pleased to announce that President Itamar Franco has recently promulgated the agreement between Brazil, the Argentine Republic, the Brazilian-Argentine Agency of Accounting and Control of Nuclear Materials and the International Atomic Energy Agency on the application of safeguards, as authorized by our National Congress. With this step and others recently taken, Brazil reinforces its contribution to the prevention of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in all its aspects and to the enhancement of international cooperation in this area.

It is our conviction that the third item inscribed on our agenda, "International arms transfers", represents a welcome opportunity for examining the disastrous consequences of the illicit arms trade. We welcome the working paper submitted by the delegation of Colombia, which will provide positive input for our consideration. Despite our heavy schedule for this session, we expect a great deal of progress on this item in order to pave the way for meaningful deliberations in the following sessions.

It is our delegation's sincere hope that the positive trends towards disarmament will become consistent and permanent, ensuring the overall objective of reducing tensions and strengthening peaceful cooperation among all nations. Clearly, the United Nations Disarmament Commission can play a key role in this regard.

The delegation of Brazil is ready to participate actively in the three Working Groups and, to this end, is prepared to work in an open and constructive spirit.

Mr. Guillen (Peru) *(interpretation from Spanish):* Please allow me, Sir, to express our pleasure at seeing you in the Chair for this session, and also to congratulate the Vice-Chairmen, the Rapporteur and the Chairmen of the three Working Groups. We feel certain that these outstanding individuals will lend our work the momentum and diplomatic management that will allow us to make progress on our agenda.

At our 1993 session we concluded negotiations in Working Group II. That effort resulted in guidelines and recommendations on the regional approach to disarmament within the context of global security; these were set out in General Assembly resolution 48/75 G. In a sincere demonstration of its desire to work in a climate of revitalization, my delegation agreed to merge the draft resolutions on this subject that had been submitted in previous years. The understanding was that there should be an acknowledgement of the efforts of the Disarmament Commission, and specifically of the Working Group so effectively chaired by Ambassador Hoffmann.

The intention was to acknowledge the existence of substantive and consensual progress, in so far as this could be reached at the time. We were pleased that many delegations agreed with this and stated publicly that continued adoption of duplicate resolutions benefited no one. Along with those delegations, we were surprised that the progress achieved in 1993 was not reflected in a single resolution reflecting that consensus, as was the initial intention of several delegations. Still, another resolution was again adopted on regional disarmament; this constituted improper duplication, and a setback compared with the Commission's achievement in 1993.

We cannot obstruct progress achieved by consensus on the basis of bilateral problems, least of all when a new situation exists. That is what happened in 1993. In April the Commission approved the guidelines and recommendations on regional disarmament, and in October we adopted two resolutions on the subject. In the view of my delegation, this is inconsistent. It is not that we disagree with the content of resolution 48/75 I; indeed, we voted in favour of that text, but did not join in sponsoring it.

The problem runs deeper. As far as possible, we must avoid duplication, particularly when this involves non-consensus elements. Had this situation not come about, the work of the Commission would have grown sounder and more suitably recognized. What is more, the work of two out of the three multilateral disarmament forums would have been duly linked.

It is our hope that this year we can conclude the item on science and technology for disarmament and make substantial progress in the area of nuclear disarmament. Moreover, we hope that these efforts will be reflected in broad consensus documents that will not give rise to subsequent unproductive duplication.

In 1993 my delegation noted the stagnation that had hobbled the work of the Disarmament Commission in earlier years. We noted, and reiterate now, that the true causes of this were lack of political will to deal with all aspects of disarmament in a multilateral framework and the inertia of automatic adherence to traditional concepts in the field of disarmament and security. Over the past year we have seen how the new format implemented in 1992 can produce results; this is palpable proof of how useful the Commission can be.

The subjects with which we shall be dealing in the Working Groups are of the highest timeliness and relevance, and must therefore be analysed skilfully and promptly. There has been clear progress in our work, including the elimination of the rigidity born of the East-West confrontation, which had made multilateral disarmament seem a Utopian goal.

It is also important to point out that the progress achieved during 1993 will have a concrete effect on negotiations in the Working Group on the process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security, with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons. Thanks to the efforts of Ambassador Batiouk, there has been considerable progress. I hope that in 1994 we will be able to conclude our deliberations and adopt a set of conclusions and recommendations on that subject. It is important to agree by consensus on the machinery for nuclear disarmament and to define the role of the United Nations in that process.

Unlike in the past, the necessary consensus exists for the adoption of a treaty for a comprehensive nuclear test-ban. In November we adopted an unprecedented resolution by consensus. Work has begun in the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. We have made progress in preparations for the fifth Review Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Faced with these issues, and with a view to working in a suitable manner, we should also be aware of the continuing danger of nuclear proliferation and the threat of its covert use as a means of persuasion in certain regional environments. Today we note that dangers arising from divergent points of view on aspects relating to nuclear inspections threaten the security of a region. We are also concerned by the potential risks arising from nuclear capabilities that could delay or frustrate the process of nuclear non-proliferation.

With regard to the item before Working Group II - the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related spheres - the efforts of its Chairman to harmonize positions, translated into the working paper drawn up by Ambassador Peggy Mason of Canada are clear. We feel certain that her skills and leadership will enable us this year to conclude the negotiations and adopt a set of guidelines and recommendations on the subject.

As a developing country, Peru is especially interested in the benefits of the peaceful use of science and technology, and particularly in the concrete results that negotiations and research on the peaceful use of military technology can have with respect to the promotion of social and economic development.

On the question of international arms transfers, an item on which my country has traditionally joined in sponsoring a draft resolution, we are pleased that this year we are beginning deliberations that will enable us to put together a consensus permitting the subsequent adoption of an instrument implementing specific commitments.

We are grateful for the illuminating document entitled "Guidelines for the control of international arms transfers aimed at eradicating the illicit arms trade", drawn up by Colombia. We feel certain that, under the chairmanship of my friend Ambassador Luis Fernando Jaramillo, we will achieve clear progress in our coming meetings.

Reference must be made to the importance of this subject today. The origins and effects of the illicit arms traffic place modern societies at great risk of destabilization. Not only does it foster tensions, but it also encourages other acts that affect the very stability of States and coerces the will of peoples. Examples of this are terrorism, the illicit drug traffic and even, though to a lesser extent, ordinary criminality. International society must adopt coordinated measures to avoid the proliferation of risks by establishing systematic control of weapons that exist within and without States' territories. That is why we must begin work not only on the subject of international arms transfers generally but also, specifically, on the illicit traffic in them as a constant, disruptive and dangerous element. It is also why that subject was inscribed on the agenda of the next session of the General Assembly, as established by resolution 48/75 F, adopted by consensus in 1993.

The continuing dangerous spiral of violence forces us to exert an iron political will to check the spread of the risk posed by regional fissiparous forces. These are now more dangerous than ever because of their military capacity and the inability to control the vast numbers of nuclear and conventional weapons of all kinds available to be marketed legally or illegally.

There is a clear direct link between the subjects we are to discuss this year. This could be exploited to good effect by adding supplementary paragraphs to each of the documents on subjects which the Working Groups will begin debating.

The transitional phase in international relations that we are now experiencing should compel us to imbue our work with a determined and sincere political will to see that the decisions adopted here by consensus are accepted and implemented. The delegation of Peru reiterates its readiness fully to cooperate towards the achievement of that goal in the full certainty that the work that we are now beginning will soon be crowned with success, to the benefit of us all.

For Peru, the linkage between security and development is of vital importance. In this regard, we have taken a number of measures domestically and at the international level to reduce military expenditure and to devote our greatest efforts to social and economic priorities. An unshakeable dedication to peace and a sound and timely interest in actively participating in contemporary economic and political relations underpin our measures. That is why we are convinced of the importance of these forums in reducing tension and contributing to broad and fruitful debates leading to consensus decisions. We wish to maintain a healthy and stable atmosphere that will permit the free development of our societies within a framework of peace, justice and development as we enter the twenty-first century.

Mr. Cissé (Senegal) *(interpretation from French):* I should like first to extend to you, Sir, and the other members of the Bureau the warm congratulations of my delegation on your election. We are convinced that, thanks to your experience and diplomatic talents, the work of the current session of the Disarmament Commission will yield tangible results. I assure you of the full support of the Senegalese delegation.

I should also like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador de Araujo Castro of Brazil, for his remarkable work at the last substantive session.

Although the international community is far from achieving the ultimate goal set out in Article 26 of the United Nations Charter -

> "to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources" -

we note that significant progress was made last year in the process of arms limitation and reduction. Thus, despite - or perhaps because of - its inherent uncertainties, this last decade of the twentieth century seems to us to bring together elements conducive to a collective stocktaking capable of registering decisive progress in the main areas of disarmament and arms control and laying the foundations of a new era of peace, cooperation and progress.

In concluding at its 1993 session its consideration of agenda item 5, entitled "Regional approach to disarmament within the context of global security", and by making decisive progress on the subjects being addressed by the other two Working Groups, the Disarmament Commission continued to demonstrate its effectiveness by making a priceless contribution to our common desire to strengthen international peace and security.

Over the next three weeks the Commission will consider three items on its agenda with the aim of concluding its consideration of two of them at the current session. The first of these, entitled "Process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security, with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons", addresses a problem that is of fundamental concern to the entire international community.

In this connection, it is heartening to note encouraging developments since last year in the effective implementation of all the provisions of the START I Treaty and the Lisbon Protocol by signatories which are members of the Commonwealth of Independent States. We also welcome the decision taken on 25 February by the Conference on Disarmament to re-establish its Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban, which was mandated to negotiate a comprehensive, global and effectively verifiable test-ban Treaty. We feel that in the context of the 1995 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), this important decision the extension of the moratorium on nuclear testing by the five declared nuclear Powers and the initiative to ban the production of arms-related materials are positive omens for the strengthening of the non-proliferation regime and the universality of the NPT.

My delegation believes that it would be wrong to stop at this first stage in the significant reduction of nuclear arsenals, and that we should, rather, pursue our joint efforts towards the complete elimination of that category of weapons, as we have done in relation to other means of mass destruction, such as biological and chemical weapons.

With South Africa's accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Africa is resolutely moving towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. The work of the Group of Experts in charge of drafting the

founding treaty should, with United Nations assistance, be finished soon.

We strongly believe that the establishment of such nuclear-weapon-free zones, whether in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, the South Pacific or the Korean peninsula, in accordance with the commitment made by the countries concerned, can only help to strengthen regional and hence world security.

That is why the delegation of Senegal attaches the greatest importance to the quest for a consensus that could lead to the adoption at the present session of guidelines and principles that could contribute to accelerating the birth of a nuclear-weapon-free world.

In regard to item 5 of our agenda, "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields", signal progress was achieved during the last three sessions in the approach to and understanding of this difficult non-proliferation topic.

We hope that during the present session more points of convergence will appear, enabling the Working Group entrusted with consideration of the subject to reach conclusions likely to promote the application of science and technology for peaceful purposes as well as the drafting of universally accepted guidelines to regulate international transfers of high technology.

During the present session our Commission will finally begin consideration of a new item entitled "International arms transfers, with particular reference to General Assembly resolution 46/36 H of 6 December 1991".

The usefulness of considering this question is obvious to us, in Africa and almost everywhere else in the third world, who are confronted by the destabilization caused by the unloading in zones of conflict of conventional-arms stocks accumulated during the cold-war period. My delegation referred to this subject during the general debate in the First Committee at the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly. It welcomed the establishment of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms in 1992 and the actual beginning of its operation in April 1993. My delegation will extend its full cooperation in this matter.

The many draft resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on this question during the present session demonstrate the international community's ever-greater concern at the scope of the phenomenon, as well as the desire to find a solution which, while respecting the legitimate right of all States to ensure their own defence, could at the same time safeguard the sometimes precarious balance underlying peace and security in some regions of the world.

Still on the question of transparency in armaments, the Conference on Disarmament also started last year, in its Ad Hoc Committee on Transparency, an important discussion which we hope will serve as an inspiration for the work of the group of governmental experts which has been entrusted with improving the operation of the Register and whose first session was held in New York from 7 to 11 February 1994.

Among the proposals which we think will capture the attention of the group of governmental experts - and also of our Commission when it begins consideration of the question - is the one formulated by the delegation of Japan during the last session and taken up by the Secretary-General last January in Geneva, with regard to regionalizing the operation to make it more effective.

We are convinced - and this is my conclusion - that, given the interest and willingness shown by Member States in various forums in regard to international arms transfers, the working group entrusted with studying the question will be able, in the time it has been given, to draw up guidelines and recommendations likely to foster the strengthening of stability, peace and security in the regions concerned.

Organization of work

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I wish there were other representatives prepared to speak this morning, but, unfortunately, that is not the case and, furthermore, there are practically no names inscribed on the list of speakers for this afternoon's meeting. Tomorrow, on the other hand, there is a very long list of speakers. I would therefore appeal to any delegations that are prepared to do so to speak now, in order to make tomorrow's two meetings less of a marathon. This is a rather difficult situation, and I would hope to be able to overcome it, with the cooperation of members of the Commission.

It appears that there are no representatives who wish to speak now. I shall therefore adjourn the meeting, and there will be no meeting this afternoon. Tomorrow we shall begin at 10 a.m. sharp. If the first speaker is not here at that time, he will be moved to the end of the list. We must not lose a minute of our time. Only in that way can we rationalize the Commission's work.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.